DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 315 078 IR 053 053

AUTHOR van Halm, Johan
TITLE Council for Cultural Cooperation. Evaluation of the EUDISED Activities.
INSTITUTION Council of Europe, Strasbourg (France).
REPORT NO CDCC-(88)-32
PUB DATE 17 Oct 88
NOTE 61p.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Foreign Countries; *International Cooperation; *Long Range Planning; Online Searching; Online Systems; *Organizational Objectives; Qualitative Research; Questionnaires; Statistical Surveys; Structural Analysis (Linguistics)
IDENTIFIERS *European Documentation and Information System

ABSTRACT

Based on interviews and on questionnaires sent to EUDISED (European Documentation and Information System) "R & D Bulletin" subscribers, and the users of the EUDISED online database, this report evaluates current EUDISED activities. The report reviews the responses to the questionnaire; assesses the current situation (a period in which those most directly concerned wish to improve the efficiency of EUDISED, but are unable to mobilize resources to realize that wish); and analyzes responses from the database users, bulletin subscribers, and national member agencies. It is recommended that: (1) adequate resources be made available within the Council of Europe secretariat and within national agencies to ensure products of quality; (2) the present activities relating to educational research project information be improved before there is expansion in other areas; (3) a more vigorous marketing effort be made; and (4) ending EUDISED activities be considered if resources for their efficient development cannot be provided. Five appendixes include: statistical data on the replies to the survey questionnaires, a table of countries that contribute to the "R & D Bulletin," and an outline of a proposed EUDISED user guide. (SD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED315078

COUNCIL OF EUROPE
CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE

Strasbourg, 17 October 1988

CDCC (88) 32
Or. Engl.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

COUNCIL FOR CULTURAL CO-OPERATION

EVALUATION OF THE EUDISED ACTIVITIES

by

Johan van HALM
Johan van Halm & Associates - Information Consultants
P.O. Box 688
NL-3800 AR AMERSFOORT

Abstract

At the request of the Council for Cultural Co-operation an evaluation of the EUDISED activities was carried out by Johan van Halm. The evaluation is based on interviews and on questionnaires sent to EUDISED R & D Bulletin subscribers and the users of the EUDISED online database. In his report Johan van Halm recommends, in particular, that adequate resources be made available within the Council of Europe secretariat and within national agencies to ensure products of quality, that the present activities relating to educational research project information should be improved before there is expansion into other areas, that a more vigorous marketing effort should be made, that consideration should be given to ending the EUDISED activities if resources for their efficient development cannot be provided. The report is accompanied by five appendixes, including statistical data concerning the replies to the questionnaires sent out.

EUDISED descriptors: EUDISED; evaluation; international cooperation; qualitative analysis; structural analysis; survey report

EUDISED

European Documentation and Information System for Education

DECS/Doc (88) 18 Final
Or. Engl.
Limited distribution

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
N.Borch-Jacobsen
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

IR053053

THIS DOCUMENT WILL NOT BE DISTRIBUTED DURING THE MEETING
PLEASE BRING THIS COPY

CONTENTS

1.	Pre-ambule and introduction	3-4
2.	Responses to the questionnaire	5-7
3.	Present situation	8
4.	Analysis of responses 1. Data base users 2. EUDISED R&D Bulletin 3. National agencies	9-19
5.	General findings and synthesis	20-28
6.	Action plan and recommendations	29-31

Appendices

1. Statistical tabulation of responses to the questionnaire for database users
2. Statistical tabulation of responses to the questionnaire for R&D bulletin users
3. Statistical tabulation of responses to the questionnaire for National agencies
4. EUDISED R&D Bulletin: contributions by country
5. European Educational Information Directory

1. INTRODUCTION AND PRE-AMBULE

The European Documentation and Information System for Education (EUDISED) was developed in the early 1970s to improve the flow of information. A detailed description of EUDISED may be found in document DECS/Doc (87) 2 revised.
The EUDISED thesaurus of descriptors for indexing now covers ten languages (the financing and management of the thesaurus is a joint activity of the Council of Europe and the Commission of the European Communities); the EUDISED database consists of computerized abstracts of educational research and development (R & D) projects supplied by 21 member states plus Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Yugoslavia. It is available online from the European Space Agency's Information Retrieval Service (ESA-IRS) and from Pergamon Orbit Infoline Ltd., as well as in the form of a printed EUDISED R & D Bulletin.

Based on the consideration, that not all educational research projects find their way into the database, not enough people subscribe to the Bulletin and not many search the database, the CDCC (the Council of Europe's Council for Cultural Cooperation) has decided at its 52nd session (23-26 June 1987) to start an evaluation of EUDISED.
The terms of reference take account of:

- instructions given by the CDCC in June 1987 and in February 1988;
- proposals of the German EUDISED Delegation (DECS/Doc (87) 14);
- document DECS/Doc (87) 27;
- comments by the EUDISED Data Network Group (meeting on 4-5 November 1987); and
- comments by the Danish CDCC Delegation.

The objectives of the evaluation of EUDISED were among other things:
to find out the views of the EUDISED agencies and EUDISED users; what they think is wrong with EUDISED and what should be improved; what needs they feel they have, which are not met by EUDISED, etc.

For the collection of the required data, a set of specially designed questionnaires have been used:

1. a questionnaire for national EUDISED agencies;
2 a questionnaire for users of the database;
3. a questionnaire for the R & D Bulletin users only.

National EUDISED Agencies have been requested to distribute the user questionnaires, as well as to collect them back for processing by the consultant. The R & D Bulletin users have been approached through questionnaires inserted in the R & D Bulletin by the publisher (Saur).

The report encompasses a synthesis and interpretation of answers collected during the interviews and from the questionnairies, rather than a summing up of responses on the questionnaires only. Appendices 1/3 consist of the tabulated responses on the questions. Statistical significanse has been achieve for responses to the questionnaires regarding the national agencies. For the "Database user Questionnaire", of which 37 have been returned, statistical significanse might be assumed, because the actual number of ESA-users is low, as well as the number of online hours (based on the ESA statistics should each respondent search an average of less than two hours).
Regarding the bulletin users an impression has been given as only a few questionnaires have been returned so far.

2. RESPONSES TO THE QUESTIONNAIRES

On September 26, 1988 - already a very much extended deadline - we have made a final count of the responses to the three questionnaires.
The responses are as follows:

	absolute figures	in %
Questionnaire to		
National agencies	16	76
Database users	37	17
Bulletin receivers/readers	13	3

See also table 1.

When we take into account the fact, that
- questionnaires have been received in the holidays period
- ESA's addresses are rather billing addresses, i.e. addresses for invoices te be sent, than addresses of users
- the subscribers list of Saur Verlag contains names of individual readers, institutions and libraries
- even national agencies don't know their EUDISED users
- sometimes many parties at the national level were involved in despatch and returns
- the contents of the questionnaires did require some time investment from the respondent,

than the responses are acceptable, also taking into account, that it takes some time to fill out these questionnaires.
Returns up till 26 September 1988 have been included in the evaluation study.

Database users

The national agencies had also been asked also to send the database questionnaires to certain educational R & D institutions or libraries they were aware off. The secretariat had send questionnaires to those addresses which are outside the CDCC area, in countries where there is no EUDISED agency (eg Australia, Canada, China, Marocco, Tunesia, USA).
To achieve a higher response to the database questionnaires they have been translated into French and German.
Only 4 out of 31 of the database respondents were end-users and they have ignored some of the questions, notably questions 11 to 22.
None of the 11 identified database users in the FR of Germany, of which names and addresses have been forwarded to the German national agency, have responded to the questionnaire.

National agencies

The questionnaire for the national agencies had to be filled out by the agency in question.

Bulletin Receivers

The Bulletin questionnaire inserted was in the English language only, while French versions were available from the secretariat on request.

The dispatch of this questionnaire was delayed with appr. 12 weeks, but more serious the return date of July 1 was printed on the questionnaire sent to Sam Verlag in May could no longer be changed (so many readers must have considered the deadline as reached at that time and did no longer bother about replying).

The respondents of the questionnaire for the database user who have returned the questionnaires filled out as a bulletin user, have been treated as "bulletin responses".

Table 1

Overview of responses received from	Questionnaires N.A.	database users actual	database users not	bulletin
Austria	x	9	1	1(d)
Belgium	x	1		1
Canada		1		
Czechoslovakia	x	1		5(d)
Cyprus	x			
Denmark	x	1		
Federal Republic of Germany	x			2
Finland	x	1		
France				2
Greece	x			
Ireland	x			
Italy	x			
Luxembourg	x	□		1
Netherlands	x(2)	3	1	
Norway		□		
Portugal		1		
Spain	x	4		
Sweden	x	3		
Switzerland	x	*		
Turkey		□		
United Kingdom ≠	x(2)	5	2	
Yugoslavia		□		1
		31	4	
Questionnaires received too late	2	2		
Totals	16	37		13
National agencies	21			
Registered ESA-users		219		
Bulletin circulation				429
Response (in %)	76	17		3

Notes

□ in these countries no database users could be identified at present
* searching is done by the national agency only
≠ not all users have been sent a questionnaire and a selection was made
NA = National Agency

3. PRESENT SITUATION

The overall aim of EUDISED is to facilitate access to educational information and by this providing at least a representative overview about education research (originally other fields were also planned).

EUDISED provides awareness of and a means of access to educational R&D projects by providing a formatted description and some form of condensation of the full project description together with descriptors (taken from the EUDISED Thesaurus) which facilitate searching.

The original EUDISED project could be well characterized by its decentralisation, multilinguality and its educational R&D coverage making it a rather unique European database.

EUDISED has gone through 3 stages of development:
an initial dynamic period followed by a period of stagnation, followed in turn by the current period characterised by the wish of those most directly concerned to improve the efficiency of EUDISED but also by the inability to mobilise resources to realise that wish.

Our point of departure - through - is that:
- the original EUDISED project was well-designed and reasonably successful in its first decade (R&D Bulletin, online database at ESA/IRS, Thesaurus)
- the present EUDISED is faced with stagnation and improvements are required
- usage is too low.

Responsible for this stagnation are, as mentioned in the various CDCC documents:
1. Resistance to a supposed trend to centralise. Apparently, the fact that EUDISED now has a central database has led to the impression, that the basic option in favour of a decentralised system has been dropped (a selection of national R&D data to be pooled at European level)
2. EURYDICE's appearance
3. EUDISED's association with computerisation
4. National priorities (through national databases)
5. Competition from other databases
6. A rather bad performance, e.g. in reaching a sufficient coverage

Furthermore to overcome the current stagnation it has been suggested this to:
- extend the scope of EUDISED, along clearly defined lines, to articles from periodicals and to monographs
- take on more staff and install equipment and software to run the system better.

The results of the evaluation should lead to measures to overcome this stagnation.

4. ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES

4.1. Analysis of the database evaluation

With a response of 17% or 37 of all registered ESA users we may assume to cover nearly all actual users of the database, as the total usage in the first half of 1988 was only 19,3 hours (compared to 25,5 in 1985),* see also appendix 1.

In 1987 the database was used 64,8 hours, bringing revenues of FF 5,421.14 ($ 850.00). The largest usage was in the Netherlands (24%), UK (16%), Finland (14%), Italy (7%), and Austria (5%).

Database users

Most database users have access to a library or documentation centre, with a relatively small number of staff. Half of them work in a library, others in ministries (15%), policy/advisory institutes (18%) or research institutes (30%). They consider online searching essential (60%) or important (30%) and the majority is a regular searcher (daily-weekly) using a micro cumputer at a baud rate of 1200. 50% of the users mentioned an annual online budget of more than $ 5.000.-- or appr. $ 500 a month.
The pricing structure is acceptable, but price increases are not welcomed.
Awareness counts nearly completely to non-EUDISED channels, notably through ESA.

The database

The EUDISED database ranks from good to moderate in comparison to other sources of information and half of the users have been users for more than 2 years. These facts are supported with 50% of the users expressing a major value and 30% a moderate value. All users consider EUDISED as an worthwile product. However, the majority expresses the relevance of the data as mediocre, the same applies to the currency (up-to-dataness). Only one third feels that greater details or quantity would be required.

ESA

ESA is used by 80% of the searchers. ESA is judged good by most respondents (few logon and connect problems, good user support and an acceptable price structure).

---

* ESA usage in Austria is for EUDISED only and was appr. 3,2 hours in 1987.

Reasons for usage

Main usage is to be made aware of others in the field (50%), to be provided with new research leads (25%) and to receive new viewpoints or different interpretations of research (18%) and time saving (18%).

The most important topics for which EUDISED is used are:
- new information technology
- computer-aided learning
- European educational R&D
- European curricula
- minorities
- evaluation

Other aspects (Thesaurus, overlap, competition, profile of the database, improvements, etc.) are treated in § 5.
See also appendix 1 for a complete statistical compilation.

4.2. Analysis of the bulletin evaluation

The response to the bulletin users questionnaire has been affected seriously by its late arrival. Issue 32 of the EUDISED R&D Bulletin was dispatched mid July, but on page 2 of the questionnaire recipients are invited to respond before July 1, 1988. It had been envisaged, that the questionnaire would have been inserted in issue 31, unfortunetaly this has not been possible.
A return of 3% (13 of 429 subscribers*) has been the result.

For a statistical tabulation of data, see appendix 2.

The bulletin users might be considered as end-users and their main source of information is their own or external library/ information centre (average importance resp. 2,8 and 3,3 on a sclae, where 1 = most important and 10 = least important), however 42% did not use this service in the last two months. Appr. 50% of all users became aware of the bulletin through external publications, 20% through the EUDISED brochures and the rest via mouth-to-mouth channel or 80% of all awareness has been created through non-EUDISED channels. 85% of all users consider the bulletin of moderate value ànd worthwile (60% of the users found that many references are relevant and 50% of them are using the bulletin for more than 5 years now), despite the fact that its ranking compared with other information sources is mediocre.

Main usage is to be made\aware of others in the field (100%), to be provided with new research leads (60%) and to receive new view/points or different interpretation of research (45%). Opinions about the Thesaurus, improvements, the profile of the database, national databases of current research are given in paragraph 5.

Despite the increasing emphasis on electronic publishing, this evaluation confirms that it should be recognized that in many member states and other countries, many users will continue to rely on print as being the only source of information transfer available to them.

* The number of subscribers has been stabilized at appr. 450 during the last 4 years, of which 70% paid subscribers (at DM 178.-- or ± $ 100.-- piece). This is a relatively high score, as most other publications of the Council don't reach such a high level.

4.3. National agencies

4.3.1. Objectives of EUDISED

The objectives of EUDISED (as laid down in the CDCC's Programme) have been achieved to some extent, but not effectively. This however applies, for R&D data only and not even those, for all participating countries with respect to coverage of the databases (the database is still too small and we are still missing valuable contributions) and regarding its usage, due to lack of online access.

The majority of the agencies consider the set objectives realistic (66%), however the objectives were and are still idealistic rather than realistic, as a common international objective implies international priorities. However, national priorities, such as the development of national databases, which mostly did not exist at the start of EUDISED, have received a higher priority in most countries. Furthermore EEC countries have dual loyalties and find it sometimes difficult to cope with effective data supply to Strasbourg and Brussels (even if Brussels does not collect R&D data). There doesn't seem to be a majority for rewording the objectives of EUDISED. Another problem is that bigger countries in Europe are fairly self-sufficient and do not depend on R&D data from other countries to the same extent as the smaller or medium-size countries, for which EUDISED therefore has a much higher priority. For the sake of Europe, however, the bigger countries might have to take account of the needs of the others.

All agencies, except one, consider EUDISED a worthwhile project that fosters international co-operation among policy-makers and research workers, but it cannot be more than an instrument. However, even the largest usage cannot be called cooperation.

International cooperation in education may, through contacts and cooperation in R&D, be served and improved to a great extent (60%) by an information resource such as EUDISED, but it is not essential.

4.3.2. Completeness of R&D input

It seems, that the acquisition of information about current educational research produced by institutes, agencies and authorities is a major problem for national agencies and that a more co-operative approach at the national level (willingness and funds), could ease a number of problems as there are

- delays and irregular supply
- inconsistency
- uncomplete coverage

National agencies have expressed, that they achieve an average of 68% coverage of the relevant research projects. Full coverage is not possible, because it is not always within the power and authority of the agencies and they are faced with lack of staff.
This figure of 68% seems to be in sharp contrast with the actual level of input of projects of European interest, which has been estimated 10-15%. The input is also supplied at very irragular intervals in always varying quantities. Figures for coverage differ from country to another (see also appendix 4).

4.3.3. Users

Most agencies don't know who their users are and only 3 agencies gave a list of actual users of the database. The majority of these users belong to government agencies and they would like to see the following changes with regard to the contents and form of the EUDISED database:

- larger scope
- more up-to-date
- better coverage
- more comprehensiveness (many abstracts are written in jargon)

EUDISED is aimed at a large group of potential users, of which only a small part are possible users (being aware of EUDISED). An even smaller group consists of actual users and only an even smaller part of them are profitable users. Potential users are

- research workers
- policy and decision makers
- practioners in education

Main reasons for non-usage or unsufficient usage are

- too much competition of other databases, although not offering the same data
- databse too small
- unknown (lack of publicity) and marketing (bad support from agency)
- bureaucracy
- lack of training
- language barriers
- lack of comprehensiveness

Language barriers seem to exclude many potential users from actual usage. Other reasons seem to be

- the difference between educational systems, which makes policy-makers sceptical of applicability of work done in other countries
- the attitude of certain R&D people (indifference towards information)
- databases in the social sciences are less used than those in the natural sciences. One of the underlying reasons is certainly to be found in the fact that the budgets of institutions in the field of education were cut down in the last years and researchers are compelled to economize.

Only 4 users of the database are so-called end-users, who did not search themselves. Main reasons given are:

. it is too difficult and complicated
. I have no budget
. there are no relevant databases in my area
. expenses are difficult to justify
. lack of equipment
. use of intermediairies

4.3.4. Processing of the EUDISED datasheets

Basically a data sheet consists of the following elements

a. research organisation
b. project title
c. project leader/contact
d. summary of project
e. keywords
f. start date
g. finish date
h. status (ongoing, completed etc.)
j. sponsors
k. documentation

The data sheets which are returned to the secretariat are registered, checked and sent to PPL for (further) keywording and processing, after editing and indexing control at SVO. The secretariat receives two forms of input: the majority of the national agencies send data sheets in hard copy, while France, the FR of Germany and Austria send magnetic tapes.

Document DECS/DOC(85)22 "Guidance notes for completing the EUDISED R&D worksheet" contains a detailed description of the manner in which the worksheets should be completed and there has been no evidence that this document is obsolete. Except for new development like the provision of data sheets in machine-readable form after downloading from national database. This might overcome a situation whereby PPL cannot process tapes, because its tagging creates difficulties.

All efforts should be made in trying to locate and acquire material produced by other centers. Data sheets should be passed to a national agency for editing and forwarding to the national EUDISED processing centre.
A solution to the national coverage could possible by found at the national level through a national EUDISED agency acting as "a nominated and known depository within the educational (research) structure".

This is getting more and more important with more agencies planning to download data from national databases:

. by tape-to-tape transfer	4
. by network or data transmissiion using public telephone lines	6
. by sending diskettes (often not for the time being)	10

4.3.5. Speed of production

The delay in production cannot be imputed to the need to maintain the quality of technical standards. It would be much more accurate to attribute delay to the long production chain in which the many partners rarely have the same priorities as regards use of their time. Currency (up-to-dateness) has a high priority amongst users.

The many parties which influence the turnaround time are

research institute (eventually another clearing-house) national agency	η months
↓ mail ↓	
secretariate mail SVO	3 months
↓ mail ↓	
PPL mail Saur Verlag/ESA user	3 months
	n+6 months

At a present production time of at least one year, it is clear that η is at least 6 months. Only national agencies can affect this time lag between the start of a project and its announcement.
In general shorter links mean better quality and time control.
This leads to the conclusion, that as much as possible should be processed centrally at the Council level or under strong coordination.

In the new situation with SVO* being responsible for the receipt and for the linguistic and technical editing of the R&D worksheets tighter control of national input will be possible, as SVO is not handicapped by a 'political' status. They could more easyly express critical comments and complaints, as well as being demanding.

Most important is a regular input.
For every processing partner it is unworkable to be faced always with large spreadings in supply or an uneven workload (FR of Germany, France).

---

* Under a new arrangement the Dutch Institute for Educational research (SVO) is responsible under contract with the C.E. in Strasbourg, to check and revise incoming data before they may be processed or transferred to Peter Peregina Ltd. (PPL) in charge of computerisation.

4.3.6. EUDISED Thesaurus

Most agencies agree that there is an urgent need for a new edition of the thesaurus and that a new edition should include 9 languages (except Finnish, the 10th language). This is considered inevitable, otherwise it would be impossible for other countries to take it over as a national thesaurus. A minority view wants only the two official languages. Its usage in the national context is assessed good, but there are national limitations, for which a supplement of national terms for each country may be compiled.

Its joint development, together with the Commission of the European Communities and its 'EURYDICE' is considered successful. Half of the agencies is in favour or against the development of new fully structured subthesauri.
The same applies for the usefulness of the presently developed lists of specialized vocabularies.
The thesaurus is useful, but is easy only for experienced users.

4.3.7. Staffing and financial resources

Most answers regarding staffing and financial resources were given based on impressions concering the situation at the Secretariate. No one has reliable information. Fifty percent of all agencies feel that resources are used efficiently in Strasbourg and another half says no, which is the same for the work done under contract (revision of entries lay SVO, computerisation by PPL).

The majority of the agencies has the opinion that there is no proper equipment available in Strasbourg.

A majority thinks it is feasible for the Secretariate in Strasbourg to contract out more procedures, but they also believe, that it should be the policy to do as much as possible in Strasbourg, rather than looking for ad-hoc solutions by subcontracting certain portions of the work. The strategic position of the secretariat might be lost.

Most agencies prefer an international clearing-house for EUDISED in Strasbourg, but have the opinion, that staff and resources are inadequate (ly used), and not efficient and cost-effective offered. Such a decision can be made only after a manpower and cost/benefit analysis. More (indexing, translating) should be done centrally to save time and resources at the national level, but that would require an efficient, flexible and well organized secretariate, in every-day-contact and acting as a helpdesk in case of problems. More equipment would be needed.

The CDCC's decision to add its own production (publications and documents) to the EUDISED Database might be acceptable from a political and strategic, even cost-effectiviness point of view, but if the CDCC wishes to do so they should pay for it and allocate additional funds.
Adding CDCC publications would however, raise problems of consistency, unless only CDCC R&D projects would be involved, so far the database only holds R&D data. However, there is a clear need, as present access to CDCC publications is difficult.

4.3.8. The secretariat in Strasbourg

Interviews and questionnaires regarding the functioning of the secretariat reveal a mixture of opinions and statements ranging from

> capable, they do what they can, within the limits of available resources

to negative expressions, like

> incompetence (no I&D training), bad management at all levels of the Council, uncooperative, authoritarian (undiplomatic)
> and "they get no job done", as most problems have been on the agenda for years now.

All respondents agree, that the budget and number of staff is low, but sufficient, if the secretariat could be equipped properly (a one-time investment) and 'incompatibilités d'humeur' at the staff could be eliminated.
One seems to be aware of the political nature of staff appointments and that allocation of staff within the Directorate is not necessarily in relation to the merits of the work programme at the Council of Europe and the difficulties associated to the implementation of such a change.
Respondents feel that the Secretariat must remain in charge of coordination and act as clearing-house.

An international clearing-house for EUDISED should have its seat in Strasbourg, since EUDISED has always been an activity of the Council for Europe. Computerization of the data should ideally be done there, saving time and money in this way.
The products of the work (EUDISED R&D Bulletin, EUDISED database) would gain in topicality and would become more up-to-date than they are at the moment.
Of course, the clearing-house would also cooperate - as an equal partner - with the CEC in updating of the thesaurus, that means coordination of thesaurus proposals submitted by national agencies, decisions to be taken, thesaurus out-prints. An adequate thesaurus-management software would be a basic requirement for effective usage of time and work invested.

5. GENERAL FINDINGS AND SYNTHESIS

The findings and conclusions are drawn on the basis of the interviews and responses to questionnaires.

Respondents feel that
1. EUDISED is (still) a valuable project
2. EUDISED is badly managed at all Council levels and at many national agencies and suffers most of all from a 'policy' problem leading to a series of short comings
3. EUDISED faces increasing competition of other databases, even is there is no real overlap
4. EUDISED needs improvements for survival.

5.1. The value of EUDISED

EUDISED is a very good idea and an unique source of information about current educational research: it is a worthwhile project, that should be continued if we want Europe.

EUDISED's justification can be based only on the assumption, that if EUROPE is important: than we need Europe and then we might need EUDISED.

The value of EUDISED has been expressed in terms of
- the only existing database specifically devoted to educational research in Europe
- the advantage of a common database, standardized in presentation and procedures of access
- its multilinguality
- its continuity
- its decentralized character of operation
- growing Eastern European interest in EUDISED should be seen as an additional argument for developing EUDISED

5.2. Weak management and other shortcomings

EUDISED at present, is badly realized, because of rather weak management (delays and incompleteness of input) and poor secretarial work in motivating the national agencies to honour their committments and in convincing the Directorate and CDCC for allocating more and better resources at the secretariat level and national levels. EUDISED is faced also with unequal, sometimes completely inadequate, support from the 23 participating countries.

EUDISED suffers like other projects in cultural and social science areas from a difficult quantification of benefits. Its value is 'imponderable' and therefore difficult to judge by the CDCC, except on the basis of its usage and unfortunately usage is low.

EUDISED's performance as a useful information system is further affected negatively by its

- unsufficient cooperation by some of the national agencies or their representatives responsible for input
- a lack of profile, because of low promotional and marketing efforts
- political unwillingness to endorse improvements
- present 'cool' relations between the secretariat and some national agencies or their representatives responsible for the input of data to the system
- inability to maintain quality in terms of coverage and speed, as well as directives and instructions for input by national agencies, including time schedules and quantity standards

With regard to the continuity of EUDISED it has to be noted that the national work is very much person dependant. This fact has been expressed as follows:
If I stop, everything will fade away.

5.3. Overlapping of EUDISED R&D data with similar and competing national or international information services

1. National databases of current research

The majority of the respondents feel that educational research should be part of national databases of current research, which - eventually - should be linked through a European research network.
However, this - in our opinion - can only be decided on the basis of a real cost-benefit and feasibility study.
The linking of existing national database would certainly be technically possible, but it would not be cost-effective either user-friendly. It would mean in practice to search 20 or more databases instead of one. This does mean less time-efficiency for the user, higher costs language barriers and standardisation problems.

2. Overlap with other databases

EUDISED does not overlap with other (existing or planned) databases and information services, like the INED Project offered by UNESCO-IBE in Geneva and those offered by the OECD and the European Communities (EURIDYCE).
With EUDISED concentrating on R&D data from 23 countries, the agencies and users feel, that

- some overlap is useful
- INED, OECD, EURIDYCE are not an alternative
- EARN, JANET, SURFnet experiences can be useful to EUDISED, but not many people are aware of their existence yet.

3. Competition

EUDISED scores less with regard to size of the other databases; an earlier quantitative comparison of five databases shows that EUDISED has 10 to 150 times fewer indexed documents than the others, with a similar ratio in terms of approximate annual increase (see DECS (87) 31).
EUDISED's main competitor is ERIC, but other databases are used too in the area of social sciences:

	frequency mentioned
ADION	2
British Education Index	5
ERIC (Educational Resources Information Center)	21
FORIS (Forschungsinformationssystem Sozialwissenschaften)	5
FRANCIS Social Sciences (Centre de Documentation Sciences Humaines)	8
NTIS	10
Psycinfo (Psychological Abstracts)	19
Psyndex (Psychologischer Index)	8
Social SciSearch (Social Sciences Citation Index)	20
Sociological Abstracts	17
SOLIS (Sozialwissenschaftliches Literaturinformationssystem)	5

5.4. Improvements

Agencies and users have suggested the following improvements:
- to extend the profile of the database (wider scope)*
- to improve the coverage of the database*
- faster delivery of back-up documents*
- lower costs for the user
- easer retrieval and better software*
- availability on more hosts and CD-ROM or diskette*
- to upgrade skills of staff at the secretariat and at the national agencies
- better promotion and marketing*
- a simpler thesaurus with better readability using small and capital print
- faster and more efficient processing

* The suggested improvements will be described in more detail below.

5.4.1. Wider scope extending the profile of the database**

Ranking the need for a wider scope at 3,1 (on a scale from 1 to 5) was just slightly better than the wish to narrow the scope (at 3,9).
The extension of the scope to other documents has been judged positively as follows (combined data for all 3 questionnaries).

	frequency mentioned
R&D data	49
Monographs	31
EP data	36
Data about CDCC publications and documents	31
Data from Eastern Europe	21

The high ranking of EP data is in accordance with the majority that has answered the question:
"Would extendions of the coverage of the database with education periodicals be useful and practical", with "yes".

Extension with EP data has revealed however in the past, that the participating states encounter considerable difficulties in supplying the required English and French translations of titles of articles and - eventually - abstracts.
The agencies found no reason to change the selection criteria for the input of R&D data, however it has been suggested to help certain countries with the implementation of these criteria.

** Following the CDCC's decision to include its own production, contracts have been signed between the Council of Europe and external consultants. So work has started already to extend the coverage of the EUDISED database to the Council's own publications before the outcome of this evaluation.

5.4.2. Adequate coverage of the database

Most agencies have expressed their wish to fulfill their committments completely, but they realize that they only partly meet this goal (56% state they do so).
At present EUDISED covers R&D projects not too exhaustive, as its coverage is estimated at 10-15%. The majority of the agencies don't stand negatively to a minimum of regular contributions to be fixed.

They feel a contractual obligation of a minimum number of contributions would be worth trying (but would there be any sanctions?). A disadvantage could be a decrease in quality, as contributions of a poor quality might be included to make up the numbers.

All efforts should be made in trying to locate and acquire material produced by all centers in each country. Work sheets should be passed to a national agency for editing processing and forwarding to the EUDISED centre (Strasbourg, SVO).
A solution to the national coverage could possible by found at the national level through a national EUDISED agency acting as "a nominated and known depository within the educational (research) structure".

5.4.3. Document supply

When we raised the questions about 'document delivery' (questions 35-36) - we knew indeed, that EUDISED is not a bibliographical database - we wanted to find out: are people interested in document supply and final research reports of the various projects. Yes, they are (the highest priority ranking of 2,4), so a mechanism has to be set up to fulfill those requests, as this is not offered yet.

The minimum that could be done is to set-up a referral scheme with national addresses and their contact persons for the acquisition of these documents, if the normal pattern has been unsuccesful.

5.4.4. Easier retrieval and better software

Database users require certain realistic improvements, like
- searching the database in one language area only by selecting the requested language. EUDISED descriptors are given in all languages, it is preferred to select the language for the descriptors in the print-out, it would save time and money to have references printed in one language only (out of nine languages);
- there should be more and flexible online display and print commands
  . descriptor language choice (to prevent long connect time), see above
  . only abstracts, no descriptors;
- removal of old contributions;
- the compilation of an authority list of names of R&D institutions used.

JOHAN VAN HALM Associates

INFORMATION INDUSTRY
LIBRARY
INFORMATION MANAGEMENT
CONSULTANTS

36. What should be the profile of the database?

	frequency mentioned
R & D data	22
Monographs	15
EP data	12
Data about CDCC publications and documents and also	11
data from Eastern Europe	6
publications resulting from R&D	1
N/A	4

37. Should educational research be part of national databases of current research in general? ____

Yes	15
No	8
N/A	4

38. If so, should national databases be linked through - a yet not established - European research database network?

Yes	14
No	1
N/A	12

39. Would you be prepared to make yourself acquainted with a variety of national computer services which are offering these databases in the various countries?

Yes	12
No	12

40. Please use the rest of this page to comment on:
(a) the objectives of EUDISED.
(b) any other comments that you feel are suitable in order to improve the programme.

Some comments:
- more promotion needed;
- should be on ECHO (host) too;
- educational people in general are not interested in "libraries";
- EUDISED should be on CD-ROM;
- there sould be more online display and print commands
  . descriptor languages choice (to prevent long connect time)
  . only abstracts, no descriptors;
- deletion of completed R&D;
- the compilation of an authority list of names of R&D institutions used.

JOHAN VAN HALM & ASSOCIATES
P.O. BOX 688
NL-3800 AR AMERSFOORT
NETHERLANDS

TEL. +3133618024
FAX +3133650945
KvK AMERSFOORT
NR. 29529

- GIRO ACCOUNT 3704156
- AMRO BANK AMERSFOORT
ACC/NO 43.21.28.271 (Dfl.)
. 49.10.98.642(US$)

5.4.5. Availability on more hosts, CD-ROM and diskettes

The present usage does not justify any more means of access. However, a lesser but still significant opportunity made possible by EUDISED's move into electronic publishing is the availability of tapes direct to end-users for loading onto their own computers*. In particular Italy has found this service of use both for their staff, researchers and policy makers, who can be provided with SDI services and searches.

The same would apply to CDROM's for which only a PC with CD-ROM drive would be necessary. An investment of $ 20.000 would be required to supply all agencies with CD-ROM's of a database up till 1985. The newest data will be available online only for, let see another 3 years (up till 1986, the data will be available online and at CD-ROM).

---

* Such an usage might be jeoparding ESA's interests.

5.4.6 Marketing and promotion

Despite the fact, that most database users and agencies seem to inform potential users about EUDISED, its awareness and usage is still not high.
Awareness has been achieved mainly through non-EUDISED channels, as the compilation beneath shows.

Existence of EUDISED was found through

	frequency mentioned
exhibitions (with the Council present)	-
brochures	5
publications	11
reviews	-
publicity in other journals	2
through ESA/IRS**	12

We like to suggest the promotion and marketing to be performed at the levels of:
- the Council of Europe (EUDISED Secretariat and 'Marketing and Publications Department')
- the participating countries through its national agencies (like promotional leaflets made by the agencies in Italy and Switzerland)
- ESA/IRS
- Saur Verlag

Instruments to be used are:
- exhibitions were the Council appears anyhow (London Book Fair, Frankfurt Book Fair, DIDACTA)
- Conference reviews
- articles in journals (I'M and other online and educational journals)
- marketing pieces (brochures, etc.) using direct mail and EUDISED's mailing list*
- ESA/IRS materials (News & Views, manuals**)
- ECHO Data base guide
- user guides, like a recommended EEI Guide
- posters

See also Appendix 4.

---

* The present EUDISED mailing list, which contains of appr. 1,200 addresses spread over 62 countries, could be a basis for intensified promotion and marketing of EUDISED products.

** EUDISED should for instance appear under the heading 'Education', rather than under 'general' on the ESA/IRS list of databases.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS AND ACTION PLAN

6.1. Recommendations

It is recommended to

1. Undertake a manpower and cost/benefit analysis of the organisation of the secretariat, as a follow-up of the present user evaluation.

2. That recommendation 1 should be followed by the creation of the right infrastructure (word processing, computer access a number of staff reflecting the tasks of the secretariate) to achieve a quality product.

3. Keep the coordinating function of the Secretariat, incl. policy development and management control, in order to maintain standards for quality and input numbers. Member States of the CDCC may not be motivated to develop their national EUDISED agencies, if they see no similar development within the Council of Europe.

4. Stimulate the supply on tape and preferably on diskettes (ASCII file) from national databases offered in the standard EUDISED format only. Extra conversion costs should be borne by the relevant agency, if different formats will be offered and a one time conversion has to be developed (by PPL).

5. That, if EUDISED has to improved, then sufficient resources have to be allocated both at the level of the Secretariat and at the national level.

6. That countries not willing to give full support to EUDISED, should be asked to interupt their participation, till the moment, they will be able to honour their committments.

7. That the present R&D activities should be improved before any expansion into other areas could take place.

8. Have a full staff member at the Council for thesaurus activities, incl. the EUDISED thesaurus.

9. Organize training workshops to improve the input and delivery process of national agencies, in line with SVO's initiative.

10. Further explore the establishment of a document supply mechanism. It's start could be a 'how to' description in the EUDISED User Guide (see also recommendation 11).

11. Compile an EUDISED User Guide to be distributed by the Secretariat, Council of Europe's Publications Department and Press & Information Directorate, national agencies or their respresentatives. Such a guide might improve the usage of EUDISED.

12. Identify potential EUDISED users and consequently to execute a market survey among the present non-users.
The present evaluation was directed to a target group of users already aware of EUDISED; its response is encouraging, but it would be of much help for the future planning of EUDISED to have solid data about the needs of this (large) group of potential users.

13. Compile of a general brochure, which should encourage educational policy makers to pay greater attention to R&D data.

6.2. Plan of action

Our recommended plan of action to the CDCC includes

1. To execute a manpower and cost/benefit analysis of the procedures and organisation of the secretariate, eventually leading to additional funding and strengthning of the Secretariat.

2. To invite assurances and committments from CDCC members concerning the continuity and fulfilment at the national level by making available sufficient staff and funds to their national agencies.

3. To stimulate information exchange between staff members of national agencies through training and workshops to improve quality of the input.

4. To allocate funds for a promotion and marketing plan with the aim to multiply the online usage.

5. To stop EUDISED, if the first four actions cannot been taken.

Appendix 1

EUDISED QUESTIONNAIRE FOR DATABASE USERS - STATISTICAL RESPONSE

GENERAL

1. How would you **rank** the following sources, in fulfilling your information needs, **before** you began to make use of EUDISED (please rank 1 to 10 (1 = most important and 10 = least important) and tick subsections).

ranking	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	in %
colleagues within my organisation	4	3	4	2	3	2	1	-	2	1	4,2
communications with outside colleagues	1	2	-	7	-	4	2	1	-	1	5
conferences	2	-	1	1	2	2	4	1	1	1	5,7
in-house library/information centre	13	4	3	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	2
external library/information centre	-	4	4	4	2	1	1	2	-	-	4,2
use of an intermediary	1	-	1	-	5	-	-	2	2	1	6
serendipity	-	-	1	1	2	2	1	4	1	2	6,9
private purchase of reading material	-	1	1	2	-	1	1	2	4	1	6,8
online databases	10	3	4	1	2	2	1	2	-	1	3,3

	frequency
videotex	4
N/A	3

in %

2. Are most of your information requests handled internally or does your department use external services for most requests? Please, tick one answer only.

Handled internally	10
Use both equally	15
Use external services	2
Don't know	1
N/A	2

3. Do you or does your department have access to an internal library or information center?

Yes	24
No	1
Don't know	1

4. Appr. how many full time staff members are there in this library information center?

	in %
None	1
1-4	11
5-9	6
Over 9	8
Don't know	1

5. Appr. how many times during the past two months did you use resource materials from this library information center?

None	1
1-4	5
5-9	3
Over 9 times	14
Don't know	-
N/A	4

6. How did you find out about the existence of the EUDISED?

through

exhibitions	-
brochures	5
publications	11
review	-
publicity in other journals	2
other	12

o.w. ESA

7. Please give the three most important topics which you use EUDISED for? We have compiled a list of topics mentioned in order of frequency

New information technology	4
Computer-aided learning	4
European educational R&D	3
European curricula	2
Minorities	2
Evaluation	2

8. Where would you rank EUDISED in terms of the other sources of information listed in question 1 (please circle)? (1 = most important, 10 = least important).

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	N/A
frequency mentioned	2	3	5	2	7	5	-	1	3	-	2

9. How does EUDISED compare to other information sources on a scale of 1 (very favourably) to 10 (very poorly)?

a) other non-electronic information sources:

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	N/A
frequency	3	4	3	3	9	2	3	-	2	-	1

b) other electronic information sources:

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	N/A
frequency	2	3	6	2	5	1	3	2	4	1	1

10. How long have you used EUDISED?

a) Online

Under 6 months	8	2-5 years	13
6 months - 2 years	2	Over 5 years	3

b) The bulletin

Under 6 months	4	2-5 years	4
6 months - 2 years	2	Over 5 years	6
N/A	12		
not used at all	3		

ONLINE SEARCHING (Please, tick one answer only)

11. How important, to you personally, is online information? Is it .....

Essential	19
Important	9
Only slightly important	-
Not at all important	-
N/A	1

12. Are you familiar with an information retrieval process that involves online searching of computer data-bases?

Yes	25
No	3

13. How frequently do you use the results of online searches?

Very often	16
Sometimes	6
Rarely	1
Not applicable	4

14. Do you yourself conduct these searches?

Yes (go to 16)	21
No (go to 15)	6

15. Why don't you?

I have a library	2
I use an intermedairy	4
Too expensive	___
Too complicated	___
I prefer phone	___
Beneath my status	___
I can't type	___
Don't have terminal	2

16. About how often do you search?

More than 1/day	2
Daily	4
Weekly	11
Monthly	1
Less than monthly	4

ONLINE SEARCHING OF EUDISED

17. In order to make use of the EUDISED database I am using the following:

videotex	2
microcomputer	16
baud rate 1200	10
baud rate 300	4
auto-dialling?	5
auto-logon?	4
wordprocessing software	5
other software package/s	2
specify, e.g. downloading software	

18. I experienced delays in subscribing to the EUDISED database.

No	18
Yes	1
N/A	2

19. Did you experience any logon and connect (access) problems.

No	18
Yes, the cause of delay was	3
in-house	2
PTT	1

20. How long did it take to learn how to use the EUDISED database?

responses from 5 minutes to 1 month, mostly mentioned: 0,5 day.

21. Was there sufficient user support?

Yes	15
No	7
N/A	1

If no:
Were any of the following reasons applicable?

lack of documentation	5
overcomplicated system	___
other	___
specify	

22. Are you using

ESA/IRS	20
the Pergamon/ORBIT/Infoline gateway	4
N/A	2

23. Please tick the related databases you access.

	frequency mentioned
ADION	2
British Education Index (no longer online)	5
DIPP (Pedagogische Bibliografie)	-
ERIC (Educational Resources Information Center)	21
EURYDICE of the EEC (not yet online)	-
FORIS (Forschungsinformationssystem Sozialwissenschaften)	5
FRANCIS Social Sciences (Centre de Documentation Sciences Humaines)	8
NTIS	10
Psycinfo (Psychological Abstracts)	19
Psyndex (Psychologischer Index)	8
Social SciSearch (Social Sciences Citation Index)	20
Sociological Abstracts	17
SOLIS (Sozialwissenschaftliches Literaturinformationssystem)	5

24. Do you feel that EUDISED might overlap with other (existing or planned) databases, facilities and information services, like the INED Project offered by UNESCO-IBE in Geneva and those offered by the OECD and the European Communities (EURYDICE).

Yes	1
No	4
N/A	3
Don't know	8

25. Is the current pricing structure acceptable?

Yes	22
No	1
N/A	3

26. Would you be prepared to spend more?

Yes	5
No	18
N/A	1

27. What is your annual budget for accessing public databases?

Under ECU 1,000	4	ECU 5,000 - 10,000	5
ECU 1,000 - 5,000	6	Over ECU 10,000	5
confidential	3		
no special budget	2		

28. What is your short term plan for accessing databases?

No change	13	Decreasing use	-
Increasing use	12		

29. What is your average total monthly bill for the usage of all databases?

under ECU 100	4
ECU 100-500	2
ECU 500-1000	1
over 1000	5
confidential	7
N/A	2

30. How would you rate the overall usefulness of this service to you?

Major value	13
Moderate value	9
Minor value	1
No value	-
N/A	3

Is the EUDISED database worthwhile? Yes 25 No 1

31. How well do the references meet your requirements?
(Tick one answer only)

Most are relevant	2
Many are relevant	14
Few are relevant	10
No entries are relevant	1

Should any information be offered in greater detail or quantity?

Yes	9
No	5
N/A	8

Are certain data no longer needed to be collected?

Yes	3
No	6
N/A	12

How up to date is the information

	(1 = most up-to-date)					
	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
frequency	1	5	9	3	2	5

32. Has EUDISED helped you in your work? (check all applicable)

Prevented duplication of research conducted elsewhere	5
Made aware of others in the field	14
Provided new research leads	7
Suggested new viewpoints or different interpretation of research	5
Made more time availably for research	5
Don't know	1
N/A	6

So, it was actually useful	yes	19
	no	-
	N/A	6

Has the fact that the database is not sufficiently used something to do with fundamental problems elsewhere, e.g. a general unwillingness many of policy-makers and researchers to use R & D data?
What are other reasons for non-usage? Responses in order of frequency:

too small database	4
bad promotion by nat. agency	4
lack of comprehensiveness	2
too much competition	2

33. Do you tell other people about EUDISED?

Yes	22
No	4
N/A	2

34. EUDISED THESAURUS

- How useful do you find the thesaurus
  . do you use versions of the EUDISED thesaurus, which include your national vocabulary?

Yes	15
No	2
N/A	3

  . is it easy to use?

Yes	16
No	3

- Should fully structured subthesauri be developed (see, for instance, lists of specialised vocabulary used in modern language teaching and special education) and are the prese..tly developed subsets useful?

Yes	8
No	3
N/A	6

Do you think, that the EUDISED Thesaurus can function independently of the EUDISED database as such?

Yes	17
No	5
N/A	9

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENTS

35. Which of the following categories, sould be improved.

narrower scope of information (but better defined)	7
wider scope of information	15
better software	7
better hardware	6
lower costs	9
N/A	6
faster delivery of documents quoted	9

Have you ever tried to get hold of any of these documents?

Yes	9
No	9
N/A	8

And did you succeed?

Yes	6
No	3
N/A	9

INFORMATION ABOUT YOUR ORGANISATION

41. My organisation is:

Profit making	1
Nonprofit making	25

42. My organisation is:

A department of education	4
An educational policy/advisory institute	5
Research Institute	8
university 5	
private -	
public 2	
Library	10
Documentation Centre	5
Other	3

Appendix 2

EUDISED QUESTIONNAIRE FOR BULLETIN USERS ONLY*

GENERAL

1. How would you **rank** the following sources, in fulfilling your information needs, **before** you began to make use of EUDISED (please rank 1 to 10 (1 = most important and 10 = least important) and tick subsections).

	average importance
colleagues within my organisation	5,5
communications with outside colleagues	5,4
conferences	6,7
in-house library/information centre	2,8
external library/information centre	3,3
use of an intermediary	5,8
serendipity	5,5
private purchase of reading material	6,1
electronic databases	6,6

2. Are most of <u>your</u> own information requests handled internally or does your organisation use external services for most requests? Please, tick one answer only.

	in %
Handled internally	31
Use both equally	31
Use external services	23
Use neither	-
Don't know	-
Not applicable	15

3. Do you or does your organisation have access to an internal library or information center?

Yes	92
No	-
Don't know	-
Not applicable	8

4. Appr. how many <u>full time</u> staff members are there in this library or information center?

None	8
1-4	23
5-9	8
Over 9	38
Don't know	23
Confidential information	-

* The attached cover letter explains the EUDISED evaluation.

5. Appr. how many times during the past two months did you use resource materials from this library information center?

	in %
None	42
1-4	17
5-9	33
Over 9	8
Don't know	-

EUDISED BULLETIN

6. How did you find out about the existence of the EUDISED?

through

exhibitions	6
brochures	19
publications	19
review	6
publicity in other journals	19
other	31

please specify: mouth-to-mouth

7. Please give the three most important topics which you use EUDISED for?

'Eloboration of studies' was mentioned 2 times, more than 20 topics have been mentioned one time only.

8. Where would you rank EUDISED in terms of the other sources of information listed in question 1 (please circle)? (1 = most important, 10 = least important).

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
frequency	-	1	2	1	3	-	2	-	-	-

9. How does EUDISED compare to other information sources on a scale of 1 (very favourably) to 10 (very poorly)?

a) other non-electronic information sources:

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
frequency	1	-	4	1	1	2	1	1	-	-

b) other electronic information sources:

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
frequency	-	1	2	1	3	-	2	-	-	-

10. How long have you used the EUDISED R & D Bulletin?

Under 6 months	2	2-5 years	1
6 months - 2 years	3	Over 5 years	6

11. Which other printed bulletins in this area do you use?

ERIC has been mentioned most, together with a large variety of others.

12. Is the current pricing acceptable?

	in %
Yes	23
No	23
N/A	54

13. Would you be prepared to spend more?

No significant response.

14. When you receive the EUDISED R&D Bulletin do you (these questions have been answered by bulletin recipients only).

a. Read it through	always: 4	never: 1
b. Turn to specific items of interest and ignore others	usually: 2	never: 1

15. How would you rate the overall usefulness of this service to you?

		in %
Major value		15
Moderate value		85
Minor value		-
No value		-
Is the EUDISED R&D Bulletin worthwhile?	Yes	85
	No	-

QUALITY

16. How well do the references meet your requirements? (Tick one answer only)

Most are relevant	10
Many are relevant	60
Few are relevant	30
No articles are relevant	-

JOHAN VAN HALM & ASSOCIATES
P.O. BOX 688
NL-3800 AR AMERSFOORT
NETHERLANDS

TEL. +3133618024
FAX +3133650945
KvK AMERSFOORT
NR. 29529

- GIRO ACCOUNT 3704156
- AMRO BANK AMERSFOORT
ACC/NO 43.21.28.271 (Dfl.)
. 49.10.98.642(US$)

	in %
Should any information be offered in greater detail or quantity?	
Yes	70
No	30
Are certain data no longer needed to be collected?	
Yes	20
No	80

For which fields is there not enough data available, please specify?

innovations (only answer)

___ How well do you understand:
English all
French very few } respondents
German reasonable numbers

___ how up to date is the information: reasonable

17. Has EUDISED helped you in your work? (check all applicable)

Prevented duplication of research conducted elsewhere	15
Made aware of others in the field	100
Provided new research leads	60
Suggested new viewpoints or different interpretation of research	45
Made more time availably for research	8
Other (please specify)	-
So, it was actually useful Yes	85
No	15

Has the fact that the database is not sufficiently used something to do with fundamental problems elsewhere, e.g. a general unwillingness of many policy-makers and researchers to use R & D data?
What are other reasons for non-usage?

information to old;
inability to recognize their mismanagement.

18. Do you tell other people about EUDISED?

Yes	85
No	15

19. EUDISED THESAURUS — in %

- How useful do you find the thesaurus
  . do you use versions of the EUDISED thesaurus, which include your national vocabulary?
    Yes 81
    No 19
  . is it easy to use?
    Yes 50
    No 50
- Should fully structured subthesauri be developed (see, for instance, lists of specialised vocabulary used in modern language teaching and special education) and are the presently developed subsets useful?
  Yes 80
  No 20
- Do you think, that the EUDISED Thesaurus can function independently of the EUDISED database as such?
  Yes 80
  No -
  N/A 20

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENTS

20. Which of the following categories, if improved, would rank as most important for increased use of EUDISED?

narrower scope of information (but better defined) 60
wider scope of information 26
better software 15
better hardware 15
lower costs 30
faster delivery of documents belonging to described projects 60

21. What should be the profile of the database?

R & D data 77
Monographs 53
EP data 77
Data about CDCC publications and documents, and also data from Eastern Europe 53 17

22. Should educational research be part of national databases of current research in general?

Yes 85
No 15

23. If so, should national databases be linked through - a yet not established - European research database network?

Yes	85
No	-
N/A	15

24. Would you be prepared to make yourself acquainted with a variety of national computer services which are offering these databases in the various countries?

Yes	60
No	30
N/A	10

JOHAN VAN HALM & ASSOCIATES
P.O. BOX 688
NL-3800 AR AMERSFOORT
NETHERLANDS

TEL. +3133618024
FAX +3133650945
KvK AMERSFOORT
NR. 29529

- GIRO ACCOUNT 3704156
- AMRO BANK AMERSFOORT
ACC/NO 43.21.28.271 (Dfl.)
. 49.10.98.642(US$) H0026/H

Appendix 3

EUDISED EVALUATION STUDY - Questionnaire for the national agencies
(response base 16)

OBJECTIVES OF EUDISED

1. To what extent have the objectives of EUDISED (as laid down in the CDCC's Programme) been achieved, namely to facilitate accents to educational information both nationally and internationally?

Yes, to some extend

For R&D data only and not even that, for all participating countries with respect to coverage of the databases (the database is still to small and we are still missing valuable contributions) and regarding its usage throught lack of online access.

2. Have these objectives been realistic?

Yes	11
No	5

The objectives were and are still idealistic rather than realistic, as a common international objective implies international priorities. However, national priorities, like the development of national databases, which mostly did not exist at the start of EUDISED, have received a higher priority in most countries. Furthermore EEC countries have dual loyalties.

Should they be reworded?

Yes	7
No	5
Don't know	3

3. Are they being achieved effectively?

Yes	2
Yes, only partly	3
No (bad quality control, future is questionnable)	1
Don't know	4

4. Is EUDISED a worthwhile project (as has been assumed by the CDCC so far)?

Yes	15
No	1

5. Does EUDISED in its present form foster international co-operation among policy-makers and research workers?

Yes	14
No	2

It can improve research and policy making, not as such, but it may be an instrument, however even the largest usage cannot be called cooperation.

6. To what extent does international co-operation in education have to be based on information systems, such as EUDISED, to be effective?

To great extent	9
Other systems are important too	3
None	2

International cooperation in education may, through contacts and cooperation in R&D, be served and improved to a great extend by an information resource such as EUDISED, but it is not essential.

STAFFING AND FINANCIAL RESOURCES, COST EFFECTIVENESS

The data collected will be used for a qualitative and quantitative analysis of resources both at national and at Council of Europe level in relation to and publishing EUDISED data, as well as, in relation to processing procedures used for supplying data (worksheets or computer tapes) to the Secretariat and Peter Pelegrinius Ltd. Most answers were given as based on the impression of the situation at the Secretariate. No one has hard information.

7. Are resources used efficiently in Strasbourg?
   - staff (time, working methods)

Yes	8
No	7
Don't know	1

   - work done under contract (PPL, writing and revision of entries)?

Yes	6
No	5

   - is there proper equipment?

Yes	5
No	9

8. Would it be feasible for the Secretariat in Strasbourg to contract out even more procedures?

Technically and organisational

Yes	8
No	2
May be	3

It should be the policy to do as much as possible in Strasbourg, rather than looking for ad-hoc solutions by subcontracting certain portions of the work. The strategic position of the secretariat might be at stake.

9. How would you prefer an international clearing-house for EUDISED (in Strasbourg) to be organised as regards staff and equipment?

Staff and resources are inadequate(ly used), so such a decision can be made only after an analysis, but more should be done centrally to save time and resources at the national level, but then would be required an efficient, flexible and well organized secretariat, in every-day-contact and acting as a helpdesk in case if problems; therefore more equipment would be needed.

10. Is the service offered as efficient and cost-effective as it might be?

Yes	2
No	12
Don't know	1

11. If the CDCC's decision to add its own production (publications and documents) to the EUDISED Database is to be implemented at Secretariat level, this will necessarily result in a slight increase of the EUDISED budget (because of the Secretariat would have to pay for computerisation and publication of each additional entry). This extension would not have a decentral implication. Is this acceptable?

Yes	14
No	2

It might be acceptable from a political and strategic, even cost-effectiviness point of view, but it is CDCC's wish to do so and according they should pay for it by allocating additional funds. It is certainly not acceptable, if the consistency of an R&D data-base is kept in mind, unless other CDCC R&D projects would be involved. There is a need as present access is difficult.

12. CDCC countries invest large sums of money in educational research; can one say that this money is used properly if Europe-wide access to the reseach results is nog given through EUDISED?

Yes	7
No	7

EUDISED is one channel only and one of a relatively low quality; there are other channels, better targeted.

OVERLAPPING OF EUDISED R & D DATA WITH SIMILAR NATIONAL OR INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION SERVICES

13. Would it be possible and cost-effective to integrate existing national databases within the framework of a European data network?

This can only be decided on the basis of a real cost-benefit and feasibility study.

Yes	12
No	4

The linking of existing national database would certainly be technically possible but it would not be cost-effective. It would mean in practice to search 20 or more databases instead of one. What does that mean with respect to time-efficiency and the costs implied?

14. Does EUDISED overlap with other (existing or planned) databases and information services, like the INED Project offered by UNESCO-IBE in Geneva and those offered by the OECD, the European Communities.

- a possitive overlap is useful
- INED, OECD, EURIDYCE are not an alternative
- EARN, JANET, SURFnet experiences can be useful to EUDISED
- not many people are aware of their existence

Yes	4
No	13

JOHAN VAN HALM & ASSOCIATES
P.O. BOX 688
NL-3800 AR AMERSFOORT
NETHERLANDS

TEL. +3133618024
FAX +3133650945
KvK AMERSFOORT
NR. 29529

- GIRO ACCOUNT 3704156
- AMRO BANK AMERSFOORT
ACC/NO 43.21.28.271 (Dfl.)
. 49.10.98.642(US$)

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENTS

15. Which of the following categories, if improved, would rank as most important for increased consultation of EUDISED? (please rank 1 (most important) to 5 (least important)).

narrower scope of information (but better defined)	3,9
wider scope of information	3,1
better software (at the host's end)	3,8
better hardware (at the user's end)	3,4
lower costs (for the user)	3,8
faster delivery of back-up documents	2,4

16. What should be the profile of the database? (please tick all possibilities if required)

R & D data	16
Monographs	10
EP data	13
Data about CDCC publications and documents, and also	14
data from Eastern Europe	13

17. Should educational research be part of national databases of current research in general?

Yes	9
No	6

To make educational research part of national databases of current research in general would be - I suppose - a disadvantage for the retrieval of educational research data. Noise as a result of searches would increase. A database limited to the field of education has the advantage that anybody interested in educational data knows where to find the information needed and is not compelled to filter it out of a large amount of general research data.

18. If so, should national databases be linked through - a yet not established - European research database network?

Yes	12
No, because of emerging language problems	2
N/A	1

19. Would you be prepared to make yourself acquainted with a variety of national computer services (query and command languages) which are offering these databases?

Yes	8
No	10

It would be a difficult task for people retrieving databases to search 22 or more databases instead of one (waste of time and money). Otherwise valuable information will be lost - if only a few national databases are searched - and inter-European cooperation will decrease. Professionalists in the field would consider it a nuisance to be compelled to make themselves acqaunted with a variety of national computer services.

20. How can selection criteria for R &D be revised in the light of your experience?

The present criteria are reasonable, but should be geared more to user needs; some countries might need assistance in implementing these criteria.

USER ANALYSIS

21. Which institutions in your country have online access to the EUDISED database? Please, list them on a appendix, if different from the list provided to you.

Most agencies don't know this or it is just the national centre (Austria, Switzerland) or no access is available.

Examples of responses received:

Greece
- National Documentation Centre
- Technical Chamber of Greece Doc. C.

UK (NFER)
- DES
- DTI
- INFER

Belgium
- CNDST
- Royal Library

Luxembourg
- Ministry of Education & Youth

22. What is their nature?

- government	
. national	11
. regional	___
. local	___
- university	3
- other research establishments	1

23. What are the wishes of these institutions with regard to the contents and form of the EUDISED database?

- larger scope
- up-to-date
- better coverage
- more comprehensive

24. Is the EUDISED R & D Bulletin worthwhile?

In general

Yes	9
No	2

Should it continue to be offered on a commercial basis?

N/A

25. Has the fact that the database and the bulletin are not sufficiently used something to do with fundamental problems, e.g. a general unwillingness of many policy-makers and researchers to use R & D data?

Yes 3
because indiffenrence of R&D people (matter of attitude) and databases in the social sciences are less used than those in the natural sciences. One of the underlying reasons is certainly to be found in the fact that the budgets of institutions in the field of education were cut down in the last years and researchers are compelled to economize.

No 9
agencies don't give enough support inadeauency for their purposes.

26. What are other reasons for non-usage or unsufficient usage?

- too small
- unknown (lack of publicity and marketing)
- bureaucracy
- lack of training
- langueage barriers

Insufficient usage may also find another reason in the fact that language abilities of researchers often do not reach the level necessary for reading, evaluating and assimilating information in English or even in French. People whose language capacities are limited cannot be expected to take the same interest in international cooperation as it were desirable for the benefit of their scientific work. It will be necessary to keep this problem in mind and to consider remedial measures.
Difference between systems make policy-makers sceptical of applicability of work in other countries (UK).

NATIONAL EUDISED AGENCIES

27. What is the wish of your agency with regard to the contents and form of the EUDISED databases?

CDCC documents
more R&D
Monographs
EP

- more up-to-date and more complete information with regard to R&D on education in Europe
- more flexible print formats
- removal of old contributions, when updating
- CD-ROM
- faster processing
- to fulfill national committments

28. What EUDISED data other than R & D data would you be prepared supply?

See also question 16. Projects carried out in the past, however, revealed that the participating states encounter considerable difficulties in supplying the required English and French translations.

29. Do you contribute enough data?

Yes	9
No	7

30. What percentage of coverage of the relevant research projects are being achieved: 68%, as an average score of all states.
If NOT fully, why not? It is not always within the power and authority of the national agency. Who often lacks enough staff too.

31. What kind of improved input procedure are you planning?

1. reuse: more input from national databases to EUDISED input in machine-readable form
2. exploring potential national suppliers.

32. Would downloading to PPL in electronic form be possible?

. by tape-to-tape transfer	4
. by network or data transmission using public telephone lines	6
. by sending diskettes (often not for the time being) be possible?	10

33. Do you tell other people about EUDISED?

All seem to do this.

EUDISED THESAURUS

34. Would you agree that there is an urgent need for a new edition of the thesaurus?

Yes	12
No	5

(Keep in mind the conflict that might arise for the needs for continuity and updating.) Should the new edition include all 9 languages in each case?

Yes	12

this is inevitable, otherwise it would be impossible for other countries to take it over as a national thesaurus

No	5

only the two official languages

35. Has its joint development, together with the Commission of the European Communities and its "EURYDICE", proved successful?

Yes	15
No	1
Don't know	1

36. Should fully structured subthesauri be developed (see, for instance, lists of specialised vocabulary used in modern language teaching and special education)?

Yes	7
No	
8 Don't know	1

If yes, in wich areas: .....

And are the presently developed subsets useful?

Yes	6
No	6

(Resources required would be accessive in relation to need and use).

37. Do you find the thesaurus useful?

Yes	9
No	1
Don't know	1

. how do you assess its usage of in the national context?

a. In general is the usage O.K., but there are national limitations.
b. The Eudised thesaurus can be used as long as national terms are not too specific. However, usage seems to be limited:
1) to use of the database and
2) for finding national equivalent terms

. is it easy to use?

Only easy for frequent users.

38. Do you have any suggestions for improvement?

To improve readability by using small and capital print.

N/A

39. Do you know about other thesauri in the area of education? Please, list them here:

	frequency mentioned
ADION	
British Educ. Index	2
CEDEFOP	3
ERIC	4
IBE/BIE	3
OECD	1
PEPSY	2
UNESCO	1

PROPOSALS FOR IMPROVING EUDISED

40. Would extensions of the coverage of the database with education periodicals be useful and practical?

Yes	12
No	5

Will it be relevant for your agency?

Yes	11
No	5
Don't know	1

41. How can the existing system of information transfer from the national agency to the secretariat be improved?

- training of secretariate staff and staff at agencies
- "Document delivery" on microfiche
- better coverage of national R&D data
- faster and more efficient processing, e.g. use of SYSTRAN
- searching databases in one language area
- more and better publicity
- availability on CD-ROM or diskette
- simpler thesaurus

42. What steps are needed to ensure that the database has adequate coverage for your country? Should there be a minimum number of regular contributions be fixed?

A contractual obligation of a minimum number of contributions would be worth to try (but could there be the sanctions?) A disadvantage could be a decrease in quality, as contributions of a poor quality might be included to make up the numbers.

43. What would be the associated costs and constraints (in the case of 42, 43 and 44)?

No solid answers, but development and infrastructural costs should be beared by the Secretariate (incl. for software). Exploitation costs for local activities by the agencies.

44. What plan of action is recommended to the CDCC? What are the options?

A real analysis of the procedures and organization of the secretariate, leading to a reorganisation and additional staffing of the secretariat.

(Formal) assurances and committments from CDCC memebers concerning the continuity and fulfilment at the national level by making available sufficient staff and funds.

Information exchange between staff members of national agencies.

51. Nature of the national agency, that have responded:

Department/Ministry of Education	8
Educational policy/research institute	4
Library/documentation centre	4

EUDISED R & D Bulletin: contributions by country

	Issue 27	Issue 28	Issue 29	Issue 30	Issue 31	Issue 32
Austria		46	65		29	
Belgium		16	9	21	24	27
Cyprus	2	3	4	10	8	3
Czechoslovakia		2				
Denmark	15	2	1	5	10	
Finland	2	16	10	2	10	18
France	11	15	10			8
Germany FR		40	31	106	61	33
Greece		1	2	1	2	1
Ireland		20	1			
Italy	7	27	14	10	45	16
Luxembourg				1		2
Netherlands	58	15	2	12	20	63
Portugal	3			2	3	
Spain	1	4	10	2	3	2
Sweden	6	4	2	10	7	
Switzerland	30		12	40	20	39
Turkey	2				1	1
UK (England & Wales)	61	5	35	1		1
UK (Scotland)	27					
UK (N. Ireland)		14	10	11	10	7
Yugoslavia		1	2	11	1	4

APPENDIX 5

EUROPEAN Educational Information Directory (EUDISED User Guide)

The European Educational Information (EEI) directory will be divided in 4 sections.

1. Introduction

   This gives background to the directory.

2. Databases, networks and services

   These would include (national) online databases, like

   ADION
   British Education Index
   DIPP (Pedagogische Bibliografie)
   ERIC (Educational Resources Information Center)
   EURYDICE of the EEC (not yet online)
   FORIS (Forschungsinformationssystem Sozialwissenschaften)
   FRANCIS Social Sciences (Centre de Documentation Sciences Humaines)
   NTIS
   Psycinfo (Psychological Abstracts)
   Psyndex (Psychologischer Index)
   Social SciSearch (Social Sciences Citation Index)
   Sociological Abstracts
   SOLIS (Sozialwissenschaftliches Literaturinformationssystem)

   professional networks, national research registers and various other services.

   All make available a database, printed index research register or similar publication. In each case enquiry facilities are available either through the database/publication or through the organisation providing the service. The information has been provided and checked by the organisations themselves. A full page is devoted to each entry, which contains the following details: provider; contact name; subjects covered; services provided and their availability.

3. List of EUDISED officers

   A list of contact persons and officers working at the National agencies and other educational research establishments and providing services to educational researchers would be included in this list. Updates could be published regularly in the EUDISED R&D Bulletin.

4. Indexes

   Indexes to people, organisations and subjects included in the directory could be provided.